

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed on April 1, 2009, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Entry of the present amendment and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 remain in this application, where claims 1, 8, 10 and 15 are independent.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 8 is allowed. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication that claim 8 is allowed. Further, independent claim 15 has been amended to include features similar to the features of the allowed claim 8. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claim 15 be allowed.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-7, 9-14 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,876,345 (Akimoto). Further, claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Akimoto in view of an article entitled "Pixel-Driving Methods for Large-Sized

Poly-Si AM-OLED Displays" (Yumoto). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7, 9-14 and 15-17 are patentable over Akimoto and Yumoto for at least the following reasons.

As noted above, claim 15 should be patentable for having features similar to the features of the allowed claim 8.

On page 2 of the Final Office Action, it is alleged that "[i]t is known to be used specifically to avoid running transistors in their linear regions." (Page 2, paragraph 3, lines 2-3) Yet no portion of Akimoto is cited. Further, on page 3 of the Final Office Action, it is noted that "[a]pplicant is urged to describe, as limitations in the claims, the particular elements or methods that cause the linear region to be avoided." (Page 3, lines 6-8)

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 does recite such features that cause the linear region to be avoided. Further, claim 10 has been amended to include similar features.

It is respectfully submitted that Akimoto, Yumoto, and combination thereof, do not disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 10 which, amongst other patentable elements, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

the height of the steps in the stepped voltage waveform is greater than the voltage width of a linear operating region of the drive transistor so that the linear operating region of the drive transistor is avoided.

Avoiding the linear operating region of the drive transistor by having the height of the voltage steps be greater than the voltage width of the linear operating region of the drive transistor, as recited in independent claims 1 and 10, is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Akimoto and Yumoto, alone or in combination. Akimoto is completely silent about operating, or not operating, transistors in any particular regions, let alone disclosing or suggesting avoiding the linear operating region of the drive transistor. Assuming, arguendo, that Akimoto discloses avoiding the linear operating region, there is still no disclosure or suggestion of doing so by having the height of the voltage steps be greater than the voltage width of the linear operating region of the drive transistor, as recited in independent claims 1 and 10.


Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1 and 10 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully requested that claims 2-7, 9, 11-14 and 16-17 also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 10 as

well as their individually patentable elements.

In addition, Applicant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
May 21, 2009

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101